



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,423	03/11/2002	Clemente Spehr	8074-3 (P13735 SB/vat)	3308
22150	7590	10/04/2006	EXAMINER	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			YIMAM, HARUN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/980,423

Applicant(s)

SPEHR, CLEMENTE

Examiner

Harun M. Yimam

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/24/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 07/24/2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Although a new ground of rejection has been used to address additional limitations that have been added to claims 24–38, a response is considered necessary for several of applicant's arguments since references Zigmond (US 6,698,020) and Goldschmidt (US 6,483,987) will continue to be used to meet several claimed limitations.

3. In response to applicant's argument (page 8, 2nd paragraph) that Goldschmidt does not teach "determining when one of said undesirable program section starts and ends...", applicant should note that it is Zigmond whom discloses that during the suppression of undesirable program sections, the triggering event indicates the appropriate time that the undesirable program sections ***starts and ends*** (column 4, lines 36-52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 24 – 27, 30, 31 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeLuca (US 5,973,723).

Considering claim 24, DeLuca discloses a method of suppressing the recording and/or reproduction of undesirable program sections (undesirable program segments, such as some commercials—column 2, lines 61-67) of a program sequence (television

broadcast programs) transmitted by a transmitter (by ground base antennas, or by satellite or cable networks—column 1, lines 64-67) to an entertainment electronic device (program receiver 10 in figure 1), comprising the steps of:

automatically analyzing said transmitted program sequence while being transmitted (column 2, line 61 - column 3, line 18), determining when one of said undesirable program sections starts (the comparator 40 in figure 1 digitizes and compares the audio and/or video program information with prestored program information from memory 50, to determine the beginning of an undesirable program segment (column 2, lines 21-60) and ends (since undesirable program segments have a predetermined duration, the delay means 45 in figure 1 determines when the undesirable program segment ends—column 3, lines 19-23), said determination comprising automatically comparing said program sequence while being transmitted with a plurality of undesired program sections stored in a database (comparator 40 in figure 1 digitizes and compares the audio and video program information with prestored program information i.e., program clip representation of at least one video image representative of an undesirable commercial segment—column 2, lines 65-67, from memory 50 in figure 1—column 2, lines 19-28), said undesired program sections stored in said database corresponding to previously identified undesirable program sections (predetermined information having at least one program clip—column 2, lines 24-37);

automatically generating a first signal (detect signal) if said program sequence starts to correlate with one of said undesired program sections stored in said database (column 2, lines 37-52);

sending said first signal to said entertainment electronic device (column 2, lines 39-41) which switches from a first operating state to a second operating state in response to said first signal (In response to the detect signal, selector 20 in figure 1, which controls the program receiver 10 i.e., entertainment electronic device, deemphasizes the current program by termination presentation of the undesirable program information and emphasizes an alternate program by substituting the alternate program information—column 3, lines 3-7);

automatically generating a second signal (a return signal) if said analysis indicates said end of one of said undesirable program sections within said program sequence (column 3, lines 19-23); and

sending said second signal (a return signal) to said entertainment electronic device, which switches from said second operating state to one of said first operating state in response to said second signal (In response to a return signal, the selector 20 is instructed to return to the originally established program—column 2, lines 19-29).

As for claim 25, DeLuca discloses that the said program sequence comprises audio and video program information (column 2, lines 19-21), and wherein each of said undesired program sections stored in said database comprises audio and video program information (column 2, lines 21-24).

With regards to claim 26, DeLuca discloses that said comparison of said program sequence with said program sections stored in said database is carried out separately

Art Unit: 2623

for said respective sound signals/audio and said picture signals/video (column 2, lines 19-24).

Regarding claim 27, DeLuca discloses that the said comparison of said program sequence with said undesired program sections stored in said database is a first criterion for determining said start of one of said undesirable program sections (column 2, lines 19-60).

With regards to claim 30, it is met by the limitations of claim 24.

Regarding claim 31, it is met by the limitations of claim 24.

With regards to claim 38, DeLuca discloses that said entertainment electronic device is a television (column 4, lines 34-37) and said program sequence is a television program sequence (television broadcast programs—column 1, lines 62-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 28, 29 and 34 - 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLuca (US 5,973,723) in view of Zigmond (US 6,698,020).

Considering claim 28, DeLuca fails to explicitly disclose that said comparison comprises a second criterion, wherein the second criterion comprises recognizing of special patterns

In analogous art, Zigmond discloses a second criterion, wherein the second criterion comprises recognizing of special patterns (column 8, lines 41-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify DeLuca's system to include a second criterion comprising recognizing of special patterns, as taught by Zigmond, for the benefit of detecting the completion of undesirable program segments without using additional signals.

As for claim 29, it is met by the combination of DeLuca and Zigmond. In particular, Zigmond discloses that determining said start of one of said undesirable program sections comprises a first weighting assessment (switching decision unit 88 in figure 5—column 15, lines 35-44) of said first criterion (comparison of said program sequence with said program sections stored in said database) and said second criteria (recognizing of special patterns) (by the structure of the video programming feed 52 in figure 3—column 7, lines 25-34 and column 15, lines 40-44), and said first signal (triggering event) is generated if said first weighting assessment reaches a predefined first threshold value (column 15, lines 52-65).

With regards to claim 34, it is met by the combination of DeLuca and Zigmond. In particular, Zigmond discloses that said first and second signals (triggering events—column 8, lines 30-54) are provided by an online service provider (column 7, lines 6-9 and 16-21), and further comprise the step of transmitting information with regard to a consumer behavior (viewer information—column 11, lines 14-30) of the user of said entertainment electronic device to said online service provider (column 4, lines 55-61 and column 10, lines 4-15).

Regarding claim 35, it is met by the combination of DeLuca and Zigmond. In particular, Zigmond discloses the steps of:

evaluating said information with regard to said consumer behavior at said online service provider (column 4, lines 25-35); and

selecting a replacement program in accordance with said evaluation and transmitting said replacement program to said entertainment electronic device by said online service provider (column 7, lines 61-67).

Considering claim 36, it is met by the combination of DeLuca and Zigmond. In particular, Zigmond discloses buffering of the replacement program (selected ads) (the transmitted selected ads are received and stored in a buffer memory - advertisement repository—column 15, lines 24-34 and column 16, lines 43-56), in a buffer memory (86 in figure 5); and temporally staggered reproduction of the buffered replacement program (the delay code embedded in the video programming stream temporally staggers the reproduction of the buffered replacement program—column 16, lines 30-43).

8. Claims 32, 33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLuca (US 5,973,723) in view of Zigmond (US 6,698,020), as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Goldschmidt (US 6,483,987).

Considering claim 32, DeLuca and Zigmond discloses that the video programming resumes upon termination of said advertisement (DeLuca— column 2, lines 19-29).

DeLuca and Zigmond fail to explicitly disclose a fourth criterion, wherein the fourth criterion comprises detecting transmitted subtitles.

In analogous art, Goldschmidt discloses a fourth criterion - detecting transmitted subtitles (column 6, lines 28-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of DeLuca and Zigmond to include detecting transmitted subtitles, as taught by Goldschmidt, for the benefit of identifying the completion of an advertisement and the resuming the video programming feed (Goldschmidt—column 6, lines 34-37).

As for claim 33, DeLuca and Zigmond fail to explicitly disclose the claimed limitations.

In analogous art, Goldschmidt discloses that said analysis to determine said end comprises a second weighting assessment (VBI analyzer 410—column 6, lines 41-44) of said third criterion (comparison of said program sequence with said preceding sequence parts) and said fourth criteria (detecting a change of a picture format of said program sequence) (column 6, line 34 – column 7, line 8), and said second signal (program indicator) is generated if said second weighting assessment reaches a predefined second threshold value (column 6, lines 41-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of DeLuca and Zigmond to include

a second weighting assessment and generation of a second signal if said second weighting assessment reaches a predefined second threshold value, as taught by Goldschmidt, for the benefit of recognizing the point wherein the video programming feed resumes in the program sequence (Goldschmidt—column 6, lines 41-65).

9. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLuca (US 5,973,723) in view of Goldschmidt (US 6,483,987).

Regarding claim 37, DeLuca and Zigmond disclose a method for suppressing the reproduction of undesirable advertisements (DeLuca—column 2, lines 61-65). DeLuca and Zigmond further disclose that the home entertainment system has video programming recording capabilities (Zigmond—column 6, lines 45-47).

DeLuca and Zigmond fail to explicitly disclose that the recording of a transmission onto a medium of a recording device contains the step of stopping said recording during said transmission of said transmitted program sequence of an undesirable program section and resuming it after the end of said undesirable program section.

In analogous art, Goldschmidt discloses that a recording of a transmission onto a medium of a recording device contains the step of stopping said recording during said transmission of said transmitted program sequence of an undesirable program section

Art Unit: 2623

(commercial) and resuming it after the end of said undesirable program section (column 1, lines 49-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined system of DeLuca and Zigmond to include the step of stopping said recording during said transmission of said transmitted program sequence of an undesirable program section (commercial) and resuming it after the end of said commercial, as taught by Goldschmidt, for the benefit of recording a desired television program without any commercial interruption.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harun M. Yimam whose telephone number is 571-272-7260. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-6000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HMY


CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600